

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-13, 15, 169 and 19 are all the claims pending in the application.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

Withdrawal of the finality of the Office action of December 20, 2007 is requested. The rejection of claims 9-11 under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112 in paragraph of the Office action is a new ground of rejection not necessitated by any amendment made to the claims, and final rejection is therefore improper. Claims 9-11 are amended above to address this new rejection, and entry of the amendments is believed appropriate and is hereby requested.

Regarding claim 10, attached hereto is a publication showing that the term “thermocoaxial” has an accepted meaning in the art.

Bosch does not teach the use of a metal liner, and Wang teaches a metal liner but Wang et al is a deposition chamber, not an etching reactor. There is no suggestion in Wang et al that a metal liner material would be at all advantageous in an etching reactor. Bosch explicitly states (lines 47-49 of column 10) that metal as a liner material would be undesirable. Wang et al does not disagree. It might be a different case if Wang et al were an etching reactor, in which case we would have two references disagreeing as to the use of a metal liner in an etching reactor. But here the only teaching one of ordinary skill in the art would see is an explicit teaching that a metal liner should not be used in an etching reactor and a teaching that a metal liner is acceptable for a deposition chamber. It is only through hindsight that one could possibly conclude that it would have been obvious to the artisan to do exactly what Bosch says not to do.

It is irrelevant that Bosch may be used as a deposition chamber, since Bosch does not teach the metal liner in any event. As to Wang et al, paragraph [0055] states that the Wang et al invention may be used in an etching chamber as well as in a deposition chamber. The Wang et al invention is the provision of a plurality of laser-drilled recesses as recited in claim 1. The material of the liner plays no role in the Wang et al invention. So if one were to use the Wang et al invention in an etching chamber, one would have provided laser-drilled recesses in an etching reactor having ceramic liner as taught by Bosch. The simple mention of an etching reactor in paragraph [0055] provides no reason why anyone would want to use a metal liner in an etching reactor.

For the above reasons, it is again respectfully submitted that the subject matter of the present claims would not have been obvious to one of skill in the art.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/DJCushing/  
David J. Cushing  
Registration No. 28,703

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 20, 2008